DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 406 CG 007 852

AUTHOR Reasons, Charles E.
TITLE Dope, Fiends, and Myths.
PUB DATE Aug 72
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at American Sociological Association's Annual Meeting (New Orleans, Louisiana, August, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Drug Abuse; *Drug Addiction; Government Role; *Information Dissemination; Information Sources; Marihuana; *Mythology; *Narcotics; Public Opinion; Research Projects

ABSTRACT

Since the social reality of the drug problem has largely emanated from the diffuse conceptions of the drug user, an analysis of the history of the "dope fiend" mythology is presented in this paper in an attempt to assess the manner in which certain publics are informed about the problem. A content analysis of drug-related imagery was made from three sources: the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, the International Index, and the Federal Narcotics Bureau's Annual Report. Articles indexed were listed under headings such as drug habit, opium habit, and narcotics addict; sources reflected popular, scientific, and vested interest perspectives. Results show that of the 29 myths presented concerning the violent addict, 21 are from the Bureau of Narcotics. The paper traces the "dope fiend" mythology from its earliest emergence and maintenance and points out that, while quantitative and qualitative variations are apparent for different sources and time periods, the imagery seems to have maintained a viability of its own. Tables and references are included. (SES)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 073406

DOPE, FIENDS, AND MYTHS

By
Charles E. Reasons, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology
University of Nebraska

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CHARLES E. REASONS
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 007 852

Paper presented at the American Sociological Association's Annual Meeting, August, 1972, New Orleans, Louisiana. Not to be quoted or reproduced without the authors permission.

DOPE, FIENDS AND MYTHS

The perception and evaluation of a social problem will greatly affect the approach to the phenomenon labelled problematic. An important facet of Quinney's (1970) theory of the social reality of crime is public conceptions of crime. "Conceptions of crime are constructed and diffused in the segments of society by various means of communication" (Quinney, 1970: 22). This applies as well to conceptions of all phenomena labelled as social problems. Therefore, we should look at the diffusion of conceptions of a social problem as an indication of the social reality of a social problem.

The social reality of the drug problem has largely emanated from the diffusion of conceptions of the drug user. According to Lindesmith (1940a: 208) a "dope fiend" mythology has been constructed about the addict as an ideology justifying the severe treatment generally accorded the drug user and is used by vested interests to frighten the public into appropriating increased funds to combat the "dope menace":

> The "dope fiend" mythology serves in short, as a rationalization of the status quo. It is a body of superstition, half-truths and misinformation which bolsters up an indefensible repressive law, the victims of which are in no position to protest. The treatment of addicts in the United States today is on no higher plane than the persecution of witches of other ages. . . .

An analysis of the history of the "dope fiend" mythology would aid in assessing the manner in which certain publics are informed concerning the problem. This would also reflect the general orientation of the source of information. According to Duster (1970: 113), "Any change in the social interpretation of narcotics use will be a result of a change in public policy. Public policy in turn is generally a reflection of the action of the most agitated and aggressive segments of the citizenry in concert with the most powerful." A content analysis concerning this imagery would provide valuable information as to its emergence and persistence.

METHODS

For the purpose of this investigation a content analysis was made of materials from three sources[1]/ (1) Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, (2) International Index and (3) the Federal Narcotics Bureau's Annual Report. For the Reader's Guide the population included all articles from 1890 through 1949[2]/ under the heading of drug habit, except for book review and foreign articles.[3]/ Also included are those articles indexed under opium habit, morphine habit, and heroin habit. Beginning in 1950, the drug habit heading was changed to narcotics habit. Therefore, all articles under this heading were included through 1970. Also included were two sub-divisions arising from narcotic habit--narcotic addict (1965-70) and narcotics and youth (1968-70).

The population for the International Index includes all articles under the heading of drug habit, excluding book reviews and foreign articles, from 1907 through 1970,[4]/ including those under the headings of opium habit and morphine habit. In 1963 a heading of narcotics addict was begun separate from the drug habit classification and is included in this analysis from 1963-70.

1/ Reader's Guide includes most popular magazines, while the International Index focuses upon academic literature in the humanities and social sciences.

2/ This begins with the first volume in 1890.

3/ Explicitely foreign articles are those with foreign language titles and foreign subject titles. These are excluded because the concern of this paper is with the United States domestic drug problem.

4/ This begins with the first volume in 1907.

Sampling of Reader's Guide and International Index populations was done proportionately according to the following time periods: (1) before 1915, (2) 1916-1937, (3) 1938-1956, and (4) 1957-70. These dates are used because they correspond with the major acts of drug legislation, i.e., Harrison Act of 1914, Marihauna Tax Act of 1937, Narcotics Control Act of 1956, and the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. The respective number of articles for each source by strata are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1.--Number of Articles appearing on the drug habit for time period for Reader's Guide 1890-1970 and International Index 1907-19[illegible]

Source	Time Period				
	I	II	III	IV	TOTAL
Reader's Guide	19	89	109	294	511
International Index	0	50	32	50	132

Because of the large quantity of articles, these strata were systematically sampled according to the proportions shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2.--Number of articles sampled for time periods from Reader's Guide 1890-1970 and International Index 1907-1970

Source	Time Period			
	I	II	III	IV
Reader's Guide	1/2,10	1/5,17	1/6,17	1/10,30
International Index	1/5,0	1/5,9	1/5,6	1/5,10

5/ Following each proportion is the number of articles sampled during that period. Initial selection was made randomly, after which each nth article was selected. Of the 99 articles in the sample, four were not available in the library and the one immediately following was taken. Therefore, the systematization was maintained.

It is felt that such proportionate sampling, based on the variability of the number of articles in each time period, provides one with a representative sample of each time period and the respective sources.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics annual Report, Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs, was analyzed from 1930-1967.[6]/ This will provide insight into the perspective of an organization with a vested interest in the "drug problem." Therefore, three sources were analyzed which reflect popular, scientific, and vested interest perspectives.

"DOPE FIEND" MYTHOLOGY

The "Dope Fiend" mythology includes the following myths:[7]/

1. The drug addict is a violent criminal. Lindesmith (1940a: 199)notes, "Drug addicts are often regarded as the most dangerous and heionous criminals and are linked up with killing and rape."

2. The drug addict is a moral degenerate. "The belief that a drug addict automatically becomes a moral degenerate, liar, thief, etc., because of the direct influence of the drugs is simply nonsense quite on a par with a belief in witchcraft. . ." (Lindesmith, 1940a: 202).

3. The drug peddler wants to convert nonusers into addicts.[8]/ "The peddler of urugs, contrary to widespread belief, does not ordinarily attempt to induce nonusers to try the drug" (1940a: 205).

4. The drug addict wants to convert nonusers into addicts. "Another current myth is that all addicts, in accordance with the proverb that misery loves company, have a positive mania for making new addicts" (1940a: 206).

6/ Although the annual report was issued earlier, beginning in the mid-twenties, 1930 represents a split with the Bureau of Prohibition and the beginning of the Bureau of Narcotics within the Treasury Department, with Harry Anslinger as its head. The last year covered was 1967, afterwhich the Bureau of Narcotics was transferred to the Justice Department and reorganized, with no annual report issued in the same manner.

7/ Images 1-4 come from Lindesmith's article on the dope fiend mythology (1940a), while image 5 comes from his article "The Drug Addict as a Psychopath" (1940b). Lindesmith makes a point of specifically applying his mythology only to users of opiate drugs. He implies that these myths apply to other drugs. "The bad reputation of the opiate user is earned for him in part by the cocaine and marihuana users" (1940a: 199). The author believes the myths to be appropriate for other drugs.

5. The drug addict takes drugs because of inferior and abnormal personality. "The central idea is that prior to becoming addicts, people are distinguished from the general population by having more than their share of traits which may be taken as evidence of abnormality, weakness, psychopathology, etc." (1940b: 914).

The unit of analysis is the theme regarding each myth. A single assertion about some subject, the theme, is most useful concerning propaganda, values, attitudes and beliefs, according to Holsti (1969: 116). The presence or absence of each myth was recorded for each sampled item.9/ For example, if an article characterized the addict as a moral degenerate, then this was noted. If the addict's moral character was discussed and the degererate image was not presented, then this was noted. This applies to all the myths under consideration. If the specific aspect of the myth's concern was discussed, e.g., personality characteristics prior to addiction, then it was noted even though the myth was not present. Therefore, we are given an indication of th proportionate times a myth is presented relative to the discussion of the specific topic.

All sampled items were recorded on coding sheets, one per item. Therefore, there were 137 sheets compiled for this investigation. Each sheet was transferred to an IBM card for statistical analysis. Through the use of both the automatic card sorter and hand sorting, the desired computations were made.

8/ Lindesmith uses the terms addict and user interchangeably, as is done in most of the literature. Therefore, such an interpretation was applied to the content analysis.

9/ The decisions of categorization were of a dichotomous nature, i.e., presence or absence of discussion, than presence or absence of myth. (See Holsti, 1969: 138-142). This undoubtedly helped, for inter-coder reliability was high. Another sociologist coded 14 items--four from the Bureau of Narcotics, five from both the International Guide and Reader's Guide--with a coefficient of reliability of .93. The coefficient of reliability is based upon the ratio of coding agreements to the total number of coding decisions (Holsti, 1969: 140).

RESULTS

In Table 3 [10]/ we are provided with an overall depiction of the number of myths presented in each source relative to the number of times they were not presented.[11]/ It is immediately evident that the Federal Bureau of Narcotics Annual Report is the most consistent and persistent presenter of the myths, with 98 percent of its discussions of the attributes containing a myth. In other words, if the specific aspect of the addict was discussed, it was nearly certain that a myth was presented. The more popular literature (Reader's Guide) presents myths about 43 percent of the time that the addict's characteristic is discussed. while the International Index, representing more scholarly material, presents a myth about one half the time (52 percent). When the specific characteristics under investigation were discussed, myths were presented 68 percent of the time, indicating the frequent appearance of the mythology in the material analyzed.

Therefore, while the Federal Bureau of Narcotics dominates in the persistent perpetuation of the myths, the other two sources allude to myths nearly one half of the time they discuss the attributes. While one might expect more popular literature to present such imagery, the findings regarding the more scholarly literature are somewhat surprising. However, it should remind one of the impact of the social milieu upon scholarly thinking.[12]/

10/ It should be noted that the following presentation deals with the number of myths and nonmyths presented in the sources analyzed. While this number does not necessarily represent the number of articles, e.g., one myth per article, both the Reader's Guide and the International Index generally have only one myth/nonmyth per article. However, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics often presents more than one myth per annual report. Therefore, a special analysis will be provided for this source.

11/ It should not be assumed that when the myth is not presented its opposite is to be found. On the contrary, most of the nonmythical presentations merely deal with another facet of the characteristic, rather than refuting the myth. For example, rather than presenting the addict as a generally non-violent criminal, he is often presented as both a violent and non-violent criminal.

12/ The "ivory tower" is not resistent to infectious ideological currents from without.

TABLE 3.--Number of myths and nonmyths appearing in articles on the drug habit in Reader's Guide 1890-1970, International Index 1907-1970, and Federal Bureau of Narcotics Annual Report 1930-1967

Source	Discuss Addict [a]					
	Myth		Nonmyth		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reader's Guide	20	42	28	58	48	100
International Index	12	52	11	48	23	100
Federal Bureau of Narcotics	46	98	1	2	47	100
Total	78	66	40	34	118	100

$\lambda_a = .21$ $\lambda_b = .31$

[a]The myths are (1) addict as a violent criminal, (2) addict as a moral degenerate, (3) pusher wants to convert non-user, (4) addict wants to convert nonuser, and (5) addict is psychologically non-normal before addiction. Nonmyth refers to a discussion of one of the pertinent aspects, e.g., addict criminality, without invoking the myth.

In order to discover whether knowing the source or the myth/nonmyth attribute would help in predicting one another, a directional measure of association for nominal data was used--lambda.[13] Lambda, using the column as the dependent variable, is .21. Therefore, if we are given knowledge of the source, it reduces our predictive error by 21 percent over merely using knowledge of the myth/nonmyth as a base of prediction. Consequently, this gives us a 21 percent proportionate increase in predictability.[14] Using the source as the dependent variable, the $lambda_b$ is .31. Thus, given the knowledge of the myth/nonmyth characteristic, our error in prediction is reduced by 31 percent over prediction based only upon the knowledge of the source, with a 31 percent proportionate increase in predictability. It would thus seem that knowledge of the myth/nonmyth characteristic is a better aid in predicting the source than using the source to predict the myth/nonmyth characteristic.

In order to discuss whether there have been any changes over time in the number and proportion of myths presented, an analysis by time period is provided in Table 4 for all of the sources combined. It is interesting to note that the mythology began appearing prior to the Harrison Act, with 50 percent of the discussions presenting a myth. Both the absolute and proportionate amount of times myths are presented greatly increases in periods II and III.

13/ Lambda provides an easily interpretable answer, with definite rules (Mueller, Schuessler, and Costner, 1970). Significance tests are not used because of the nature of the inquiry and their limited meaning (Labovitz, 1971). Furthermore, other measures of association are not used due to the type of data, nature of inquiry, and lack of specifically determined independent variables. Lambda* is a standardized version.

14/ Not all proportional reduction in error (PRE) measures are proportional increase in predictability (PIP) measures, however, lambda is.

TABLE 4.--Number of myths and nonmyths appearing in articles on the drug habit for each time period for all sources

Time	Discuss Addict[a]					
	Myth		Nonmyth		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
I (1890-1914)	4[b]	50	4	50	8	100
II (1915-1937)	17	74	6	26	23	100
III (1938-1956)	37	86	6	14	43	100
IV (1957-1970)	20	45	24	55	44	100
Total	78	66	40	34	118	100

$\lambda_a^* = .07$ $\lambda_b^* = .14$

[a]The myths are (1) addict as a violent criminal, (2) addict as a moral degenerate, (3) pusher wants to convert nonuser, (4) addict wants to convert nonuser, and (5) addict is psychologically non-normal before addiction. Nonmyth refers to a discussion of one of the pertinent aspects, e.g., addict criminality, without invoking the myth.

[b]SOURCES: Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, 1890-1970 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company), Volumes 1-30; International Index: A Guide to Periodical Literature in the Social Sciences and Humanities, 1907-1970 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company), Volumes 1-24; U. S. Bureau of Narcotics, Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs for the Years 1930-1967 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

In period II, 74 percent of the characterizations are mythical in nature, while in period III, 86 percent of the discussions are of this type. However, in period IV, only 46 percent present a myth. Thus, it appears that in both absolute and proportionate terms, the mythology reached a high from 1938-1956, with its decline in the following period.

In order to discover whether one could aid his predictive ability on one variable by knowing the second one, both lambda directional measures were used. With the column--myth/nonmyth--as the dependent variable, it was discovered that knowing the time period would reduce one's error by 7% in predicting the mythological nature of the presentation over prediction based upon knowledge only of the mythological nature. It appears that knowledge of the mythological character is a better aid in predicting the time period, with $lambda_b$ being .14. Therefore, one's ability to predict the time period is increased 14 percent by knowledge f of the mythological character, over predicting by the cima period alone.

A more specific examination of the particular myths is provided in Table 5. The only myth appearing in period I is that of the moral degenerate. It is the second most prevalent myth presented in the literature under analysis. A typical example of such characterization is cogently presented in a 1931 article in The American City (The Detroit attitude toward drug addicts: 96): "The continued use of any drug brings moral degeneracy." The most often discussed aspect of the addict, both in mythical and nonmythical terms, is the user's criminality. Of the total number of myths presented, 37 percent characterize the addict as a violent criminal. For example, in response to Lindesmith's article on the "dope fiend," Judge Twain Michelson states (1940: 375):

> It may be said that murder is murder, whatever the processes of its commission may be, and likewise a "dope fiend" is a dope fiend, whatever the source of his addiction may be. In the world of crime we find him standing in the front ranks of the most subversive and anti-social groups in the country.

TABLE 5.--Number of specific myths and nonmyths appearing on the drug habit by time period for all sources

Time Period	Discuss Addict[a]																			
	Violent Addict				Moral Degenerate				Pusher Converts				Addict Converts				Psychopath				Total			
	Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I[b] . . .	0	...	3	100	4	80	1	20	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...	4	50	4	50
II . . .	4	67	2	33	5	100	0	..	2	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	5	56	4	44	17	74	6	26
III . . .	14	78	4	22	9	90	1	10	4	100	0	...	4	100	0	...	6	86	1	14	37	86	6	14
IV . . .	11	48	12	52	3	43	4	57	1	25	3	75	2	67	1	33	3	43	4	57	20	45	24	55
Total . .	29	58	21	42	21	78	6	22	7	70	3	30	7	88	1	12	14	61	9	39	78	66	40	34

SOURCES: Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature 1890-1970 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company) Volumes 1-30); International Index: A Guide to Periodical Literature in the Social Sciences and Humanities 1907-1970 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company) Volumes 1-24; U..S. Bureau of Narcotics 1931-1968, Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs for the Years 1930-1967 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office).

[a]Nonmyth refers to a discussion of one of the pertinent aspects, e.g., addict criminality, without invoking the myth.

[b]Time periods cover the following periods: I = 1890-1914; II = 1915-1937; III = 1938-1956; IV = 1957-1970.

The violent criminal characterization appears to have gained in importance over time, remaining the most important myth in the last period analyzed.

The least frequently discussed aspect is that of the pusher's and the addict's propensity for making users out of nonusers. This is somewhat surprising, particularly considering the fear and horror invoked by the image of the pusher.

> Who is more malignant, more evil than the drug peddler? Can there be a criminal more loathed and feared than the pusher who is thought to seduce children into a life of slavery? He is the demon who spreads crime and corruption in the slums, who controls the mind and bodies of others by exploiting the cravings he has himself created. These are the images the drug peddler conjures up in the public mind (Blum, 1971: 18).

When one of these images did appear, it was most often associated with children. "Often times one old addict will corrupt at one sitting ten or twenty boys," according to a 1916 article on the "heroin habit" (Bailey, 1916: 315). Or under a Time magazine piece entitled "Crime: The Junkies" in 1957, the pusher is characterized as infesting the youth of New York City. The addict as a psychopath image appears more frequently. An example appears in a 1917 article in the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science (Gordon, 1917: 214):

> Morphinism usually occurs in individuals with a deficiency of intellectual and moral faculties. Particularly as a result of a neuropathic constitution, the fruit of hereditary tendencies.

Thus, the mythology presented in the sources under investigation emphasize the effects of the drug, violent criminality, and moral degeneracy, rather than the circumstances surrounding the initiation into use.

To obtain a clearer picture of the distribution of specific myths for each source over time, Tables 6, 7 and 8 are provided. Table 6 presents the Reader's Guide distribution of each myth for the respective time periods. Since it is the only source appearing in period I, it contains all the myths of that period. It appears that the highest proportion of myths occurred in period II with 83 percent, while in the rest of the periods myths occurred 50 percent of the time. The most prevalent myth is that of the violent addict, with the moral degenerate being second most frequent. During the last period the addict-psychopath

TABLE 6.--Number of specific myths and nonmyths appearing in the Reader's Guide articles on the drug habit, 1890-1970

Time Period	Discuss Addict[a]																			
	Violent Addict				Moral Degenerate				Pusher Converts				Addict Converts				Psychopath				Total			
	Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I[b]	0	...	3	100	4	80	1	20	0	...	0	..	0	...	0	..	0	..	0	...	4	50	4	50
II	3	100	0	...	0	..	0	...	1	100	0	..	1	100	0	..	0	..	1	100	5	83	1	17
III	1	20	4	80	1	50	1	50	0	...	0	..	1	100	0	..	0	..	1	100	3	33	6	67
IV	9	23	10	77	0	..	3	100	1	50	1	50	1	100	0	..	3	50	3	50	8	32	17	68
Total	7	29	17	71	5	50	5	50	2	67	1	33	3	100	0	..	3	38	5	62	20	42	28	58

SOURCES: Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature 1890-1970 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company) Volumes 1-30; International Index: A Guide to Periodical Literature in the Social Sciences and Humanities 1907-1970 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company) Volumes 1-24; U. S. Bureau of Narcotics 1931-1968, Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs for the Years 1930-1967 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office).

[a]Nonmyth refers to a discussion of one of the pertinent aspects, e.g., addict criminality, without invoking the myth.

[b]Time periods cover the following periods: I = 1890-1914; II = 1915-1937; III = 1938-1956; IV = 1957-1970.

image has become more prevalent, together with the discussion of such attributes. Every time the addict's predisposition concerning "turning others on" is discussed (myth 4), he is characterized as having a mania for making converts. Thus, it appears that in the more popular literature the primary imagery is that of a violent addict or a moral degenerate, with a more recent propensity for psychologizing about the addict's prior character.

A breakdown of the International Index over time by specific myths is provided in Table 7. In this more scholarly source, one discovers that the most prevalent myths are the moral degenerate and the abnormal personality, which together account for 75 percent of the myths. While the latter myth is to be expected, given the amount of psychological literature on the topic, the former moral degenerate myth is somewhat unexpected. It is also interesting to note that few violent addict images are present. Of particular interest is the fact that while myths appear in both periods II and III, they are absent in period IV. More specifically, in period III every time the specific characteristic was discussed, a myth was present, while in period IV the exact opposite is true for the same number of presentations. Therefore, it seems that scholarly attention to the topic has changed in its presentation of the addict. This reflects the more general proportionate reduction in mythical presentations noted in Table 5.

Finally, we turn our attention to the primary, most consistent perpetrator of the mythology, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics Annual Report (Table 8). Of immediate interest is the fact that nearly one half of the myths (44 percent) concern the addict as a violent criminal. This imagery appears frequently in the form of a section entitled "Violence and Addiction," "Crime and Addiction," "Marihuana Crimes," etc. For example, in the 1939 report under the heading of "Crime and Narcotics" (16-17), illustrations of cases of murder, rape, and kidnapping are given as "typical" of the addict's behavior. In a 1940 section entitled "Crimes

TABLE 7.--Number of specific myths and nonmyths appearing in the International Index articles on the drug habit, 1907-1970

Time Period	Discuss Addict[a]															
	Violent Addict				Moral Degenerate				Pusher Converts				Addict Converts				Psychopath				Total			
	Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
II[b]	0	...	1	100	3	100	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...	2	...	3	...	5	56	4	44
III	1	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	3	100	0	...	7	100	0	...
IV	0	...	2	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	2	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	7	100
Total	1	25	3	75	4	80	1	20	1	33	2	67	1	50	1	50	5	56	4	44	12	52	11	48

[a]Nonmyth refers to a discussion of one of the pertinent aspects, e.g., addict criminality, without invoking the myth.

[b]No articles appeared on the drug habit prior to 1915, thus no myths. Time periods cover the following periods: II = 1915-1937; III = 1938-1956; IV = 1957-1970.

TABLE 8.--Number of myths and nonmyths appearing in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics annual report, 1930-1967

Time Period	Discuss Addict[a]																			
	Violent Addict				Moral Degenerate				Pusher Converts				Addict Converts				Psychopath			
	Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth		Myth		Non-Myth	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
II[b]	1	50	1	50	2	100	0	...	1	100	0	...	0	...	0	...	3	100	0	...
III	12	100	0	...	7	100	0	...	3	100	0	...	2	100	0	...	3	100	0	...
IV	8	100	0	...	3	100	0	...	0	...	0	...	1	100	0	...	3	...	0	...
TOTAL	21	95	1	5	12	100	0	...	4	100	0	...	3	100	0	...	6	100	0	...

Time Period	Total			
	Myth		Non-Myth	
	N	%	N	%
II[b]	7	88	1	12
III	27	100	0	...
IV	12	100	0	...
TOTAL	46	98	1	2

[a]Nonmyth refers to a discussion of one of the pertinent aspects, e.g., addict criminality, without invoking the myth.

[b]No articles appeared on the drug habit prior to 1915, thus no myths. Time periods cover the following periods: II = 1915-1937; III = 1938-1956; IV = 1957-1970.

Associated with Marihuana" (51-53), the following statement provides an introduction: "The murders and suicide described in the following cases are typical of the crimes associated with marihuana" (52). In 1964 under the heading of "Crimes of Violence Related to Addiction and Narcotics" (22-25), vivid accounts of assaults, robbery, and murder are presented, impressing upon the reader the violence related to drug taking.

Of the 29 myths presented concerning the violent addict, 21 are from the Bureau of Narcotics! This both reinforces and reflects the "criminal approach" taken toward the addict by the bureau (Reasons, 1972).

The second most frequent myth is that of the moral degenerate. In discussing the signs of addiction the 1945 edition states: "Intellectual impairment as well as disorientation may show itself in various ways, such as weakening of moral sense, habit of telling lies, prostitution, etc." (13). In 1960 the report cites a resolution of the Maryland Law Enforcement Officers Association, Inc., responding to proposed narcotics clinics: They "would extend invitation to indulgence in drug abuse with its concommitant moral degeneration, as a grave threat to health and welfare of our teenagers" (57).

Due to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics consistent and persistent content, and because an issue often presents more than one myth, a picture of the year by year appearance of specific myths is given in Table 9. Of immediate interest is the fact that there was only one myth prior to 1936, with a consistent barrage appearing through 1943 of a variety of myths. Another concentration appears in the late forties and early fifties, again consisting of a variety of myths. However, subsequent to that period there have been both qualitative and quantitative changes of interest. From 1957-1964 the violent addict image is nearly the only myth presented. Combined with the moral degenerate image, these are all but one of the myths. Therefore, the Bureau's Annual Report has undergone a qualitative change in the type of imagery it presents. Furthermore, since 1964 the report

Associated with Marihuana" (51-53), the following statement provides an introduction: "The murders and suicide described in the following cases are typical of the crimes associated with marihuana" (52). In 1964 under the heading of "Crimes of Violence Related to Addiction and Narcotics" (22-25), vivid accounts of assaults, robbery, and murder are presented, impressing upon the reader the violence related to drug taking.

Of the 29 myths presented concerning the violent addict, 21 are from the Bureau of Narcotics! This both reinforces and reflects the "criminal approach" taken toward the addict by the bureau (Reasons, 1972).

The second most frequent myth is that of the moral degenerate. In discussing the signs of addiction the 1945 edition states: "Intellectual impairment as well as disorientation may show itself in various ways, such as weakening of moral sense, habit of telling lies, prostitution, etc." (13). In 1960 the report cites a resolution of the Maryland Law Enforcement Officers Association, Inc., responding to proposed narcotics clinics: They "would extend invitation to indulgence in drug abuse with its concommitant moral degeneration, as a grave threat to health and welfare of our teenagers" (57).

Due to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics consistent and persistent content, and because an issue often presents more than one myth, a picture of the year by year appearance of specific myths is given in Table 9. Of immediate interest is the fact that there was only one myth prior to 1936, with a consistent barrage appearing through 1943 of a variety of myths. Another concentration appears in the late forties and early fifties, again consisting of a variety of myths. However, subsequent to that period there have been both qualitative and quantitative changes of interest. From 1957-1964 the violent addict image is nearly the only myth presented. Combined with the moral degenerate image, these are all but one of the myths. Therefore, the Bureau's Annual Report has undergone a qualitative change in the type of imagery it presents. Furthermore, since 1964 the report

TABLE 9.--Number of specific myths appearing in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics Annual Report, 1930-1967

Year	Myths[a]						Year	Myths					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total		1	2	3	4	5	Total
1930						0	1949						0
1931					x	1	1950	x	x	x	x		4
1932						0	1951	x	x				2
1933						0	1952	x					1
1934						0	1953						0
1935						0	1954						0
1936	x	x			x	3	1955						0
1937		x	x		x	3	1956	x					1
1938	x	x	x		x	4	1957	x					1
1939	x	x				2	1958	x					1
1940	x		x			2	1959	x			x		2
1941	x			x		2	1960	x	x				2
1942	x	x			x	3	1961	x					1
1943	x					1	1962	x		x			2
1944						0	1963	x		x			2
1945	x	x				2	1964	x					1
1946						0	1965						0
1947		x				1	1966						0
1948	x				x	2	1967						0

[a]The myths are (1) addict as a violent criminal, (2) addict as a moral degenerate, (3) pusher wants to convert nonusers, (4) addict wants to convert nonuser, and (5) addict is psychologically non-normal before addiction.

alludes to no myths in its presentation, since it does not discuss the specific aspects. This may reflect a changing orientation within the Bureau of Narcotics.

In conclusion, the "dope fiend" mythology appears to have emerged quite early and is presented frequently. While quantitative and qualitative variations are apparent for different sources and time periods, this imagery seems to have maintained a viability of its own. Understanding its emergence and maintenance will come with further inquiry concerning the social milieu surrounding it.

REFERENCES

Bailey, F.
1916 "The heroin habit." The New Republic 5 (April 17): 314-316.

Blum, Richard
1969 Society and Drugs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
1971 "Drug pushers: A collective portrait." Trans-action 8 (July-August): 18-21.

Duster, Troy
1970 The Legislation of Morality. New York: The Free Press.

Gordon, A.
1917 "The relation of legislative acts to the problem of drug addiction." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 8 (July): 211-215.

Holsti, Ole R.
1969 Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

International Index: A Guide to Periodical Literature in the Social Sciences and Humanities
1907-
1970 New York: H. W. Wilson Company, Vol. 1024.

Labovits, S.
1970 "The nonutility of significance tests: The significance of tests of significance reconsidered." Pacific Sociological Review 13 (Summer): 141-148.

Lindesmith, Alfred R.
1940a "Dopefiend mythology." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 31 (July-August): 199-208.
1940b "The drug addict as a psychopath." American Sociological Review 5 (December): 914-920.

Michelsen, T.
1940 "Lindesmith's mythology." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 31 (November-December): 373-400.

Mueller, John H., Karl F. Schuessler, and Herbert L. Costner
1970 Statistical Reasoning in Sociology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Quinney, Richard
1970 The Social Reality of Crime. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature
1890-
1970 New York: H. W. Wilson Company, Vol. 1-30.

Reasons, C. E.
1972 "The 'Dope' On the Bureau of Narcotics in Maintaining the Criminal Approach to the Drug Problem." Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association Meeting, Portland, Oregon.

"The Detroit attitude towards drug addicts."
1931 The American City 44(February): 96.

United States Bureau of Narcotics
1931-
1968 Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs for the Years 1930-1967. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.